

R E M A R K S

The office action of January 28, 2008 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-3, 7-13 and 15-18 remain in this case, claims 4, 5, 6 and 14 being cancelled by this response.

Preliminary Comments

The numbered paragraphs below correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-6 and 14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Such action has been taken, as noted in the preliminary comments above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested. Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's indication that claims the presently pending claims are allowable.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103

7. Claims 1, 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. (US2002/0029187) in view of Kawamura et al. (US2002/0069141). A full description of this rejection is in the referenced Office Action.

Applicant respectfully disagrees, and but believes that the claims, as amended, are patentable over Meehan et al and Kawamura et al., individually and in combination, for the reasons given in the responses provided in previous replies to earlier Office Actions. The arguments are not presented again for the sake of brevity and are therefore herein incorporated by reference.

9. Claims 2-3, 12-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al., in view of Kawamura et al. and further in view of CHEP. A full description of this rejection is in the referenced Office Action.

Applicant respectfully disagrees, and but believes that the claims, as amended, are now patentable over Meehan et al and Kawamura et al., individually and in combination, for the reasons given in the responses provided in previous replies to earlier Office Actions. The arguments are not presented again for the sake of brevity and are therefore herein incorporated by reference.

10. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. in view of Kawamura et al. and further in view of Canadian Patent Council (CPC). A full description of this rejection is in the referenced Office Action.

Applicant respectfully disagrees, and but believes that the claims, as amended, are now patentable over Meehan et al and Kawamura et al., individually and in combination, for the reasons given in the responses provided in previous replies to earlier Office Actions. The arguments are not presented again for the sake of brevity and are therefore herein incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, amended as suggested by Examiner, do present subject matter that is patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all pending claims herein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
--Richards et al.--

By: / Gregory M. Hill, Reg. #31369 /
Gregory M. Hill, Registration No.: 31,369
Attorney for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: April 17, 2008